



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/747,607	12/29/2003	Francois-Xavier Drouet	FR920030014US1	6493
45095	7590	10/28/2009	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC			NGUYEN, VAN KIM T	
75 STATE ST				
14 FL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ALBANY, NY 12207			2456	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/28/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hoffmanwarnick.com

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10747607	12/29/03	DROUET ET AL.	FR920030014US1

HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC
75 STATE ST
14 FL
ALBANY, NY 12207

EXAMINER

Van Kim T. Nguyen

ART UNIT	PAPER
2456	20090731

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Replace pages 3-8 to prominently identified New Ground Of Rejection.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

7,127,492	CALO ET AL.	10-2006
6,128,644	NOZAKI	10-2000

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following grounds of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nozaki (US 6,128,644).

Regarding claim 1, as shown in Figures 1-17, Nozaki discloses a data transmission system comprising at least a data transmission network based upon an IP protocol (Figure 1; col. 1: lines 46-47); at least a content server for providing data requested by a user connected to the network (col. 1: lines 23-30, col. 6: lines 27-32 and 38-45); a plurality of proxies having a cache function, each proxy capable of having stored the requested data (proxy server is capable of caching resources; col. 6: lines 38-46), one of the proxies comprising a user proxy which receives any request for data from the user (all requests sent to local proxy server 120; col. 7: lines 19-24), and a domain name server for converting a server name provided by the user to the user proxy into an IP address of the content server (Figures 15-17; col. 16: lines 47-61 and col. 18: lines 4-28).

Nozaki also discloses the domain name server includes a table for providing an IP address if a proxy amongst the plurality of proxies, the table providing the proxy IP address to the user proxy, which provides the request for data to the proxy storing the requested data without requesting the data from the content server (Figures 15-17, col. 16: lines 29-61 and col. 18: lines 4-28).

Regarding claim 2, as shown in Figures 1-17, Nozaki discloses a method for obtaining data in an optimized way in a data transmission

system comprising at least a data transmission network based upon an IP protocol (Figure 1, col. 1: lines 46-47); at least a content server for providing data requested by a user connected to the network (col. 1: lines 23-30, col. 6: lines 27-32 and 38-45); a plurality of proxies having a cache function, each proxy capable of having stored the requested data (proxy server is capable of caching resources; Figures 2 and 17, col. 6: lines 38-46), one of the proxies comprising a user proxy which receives any request for data from the user (local proxy server 120; col. 7: lines 19-24), and a domain name server for converting a server name provided by the user to the user proxy into an IP address (col. 16: lines 29-61 and col. 18: lines 4-28).

Nozaki also discloses:

- a) determining if a table stored in the domain name server contains an entry corresponding to the server name provided by the user to the user proxy (query the proxy server management 125; col. 16: lines 51-54);
- b) determining, when there is such an entry in the table, whether the entry includes an address of a proxy amongst the plurality of proxies (col. 16: lines 51-54);
- c) returning the proxy IP address to the user proxy if such a proxy IP address is included in the entry corresponding to the server name (col. 16: lines 54-59); and
- d) sending the user request from the user proxy to the proxy IP address included in the entry (col. 16: lines 59-61).

Regarding claim 4, Nozaki also discloses determining whether the user proxy is a known proxy, the user proxy being a known proxy when it is contained in a list of proxies provided to the domain name server at an initialization of the system (it is inherent that the user proxy is a known proxy since it is essentially coupled to/integrated with the domain name server).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Calo et al (US 7,127,492).

Regarding claim 1, as shown in Figures 1-8, Calo discloses a data transmission system comprising at least a data transmission network (101; Figure 1) based upon an IP protocol; at least a content server (104; Figure 1) for providing data requested by a user (102, 103; Figure 1) connected to the network; a plurality of proxies (105, 106; Figure 1) having a cache function (701-709; Figure 7), each proxy capable of having stored the requested data (col. 1: line 55 – col. 2: line 2, and col. 5: line 65 – col. 6: line 17), one of the proxies comprising a user proxy which receives any request for data from the user (proxy server comprising load balancer; Figures 6-7, col. 3: lines 38-49 and col. 4: line 55 – col. 5: line 67).

Calo also discloses a domain name server for converting a server name provided by the user to the user proxy into an IP address of the content server (mapping machine names to IP addresses and returning an IP address corresponds to an appropriate proxy server; col. 3: lines 40-49 and col. 4: lines 58-64); and a table for providing an IP address of a proxy amongst the plurality of proxies capable of having stored the requested data (table of redirection rules specify how requests should be dispatched, based on content data requested by users, col. 5: lines 7-14).

Though Calo does not explicitly call for the DNS server including the table, but since Calo discloses all the functions described above can be implemented using a stand-alone http server (col. 5: lines 15-22) or as part of a proxy server (col. 5: lines 64-67), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine a DNS server and a table of redirection rules in Calo's proxy server for providing a complete name resolution service to all network devices.

Regarding claim 2, Calo discloses a method for obtaining data in an optimized way in a data transmission system comprising at least a data transmission network based upon an IP protocol (101); at least a content server (104) for providing data requested by a user (102, 103) connected to the network; a plurality of proxies (105, 106) having a cache function (701-709), each proxy capable of having stored the requested data, and one of the proxies comprising a user proxy which receives any request for data from the user (col. 1: line 55 – col. 2: line 2, col. 5: line 65 – col. 6: line 17, and col. 3: lines 38-49).

Calo also discloses a domain name server for converting a server name provided by the user to the user proxy into an IP address (a DNS server returns an IP address corresponding to an appropriate proxy server when a client requests an address for the backend server; col. 3: lines 20-49 and col. 4: lines 58-64).

Calo also teaches:

- a) determining if a table stored in the domain name server contains an entry corresponding to the server name provided by the user to the user proxy (mapping a machine name to address and returning an IP address corresponding to an appropriate proxy server; col. 3: lines 20-49 and col. 4: lines 58-64),
- b) determining, whether the entry includes an address of a proxy amongst the plurality of proxies (mapping a machine name to address and returning an IP address corresponding to an appropriate proxy server; col. 3: lines 20-49 and col. 4: lines 58-64),
- c) returning the proxy IP address to the user proxy corresponding to the server name (determining the appropriate proxy server based on the resource URL being requested by user; col. 5: lines 7-14), and
- d) sending the user request from the user proxy to the proxy IP address included in the entry (sending requests to appropriate proxy server; col. 4: line 58—col. 5: line 27).

Calo does not explicitly call for a table stored in the DNS server, but since DNS is a name server, i.e., server storing databases of names, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the DNS server comprises a table for providing name resolution.

Regarding claim 4, though Calo does not explicitly call for determining whether the user proxy is a known proxy, but since Calo teaches the Wide Area Load Balancer 603 implements distributing client requests to different proxy servers within the network by means of a DNS server, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made in order to load balancing requests among proxy servers, the user proxy has to be known to the DNS server.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant has argued, in substance, Calo fails to teach or suggest: a) The user proxy "receives any request for data from the user"; and b) a domain name server includes a "table for providing an IP address of a proxy amongst the plurality of proxies capable of having stored the requested data", wherein the table provides "the proxy IP address to the user proxy, which

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452